ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

August 11, 2015 3:00 p.m.

Pre-meeting to begin at 2:30 p.m.

#1	Alan Gaylin & Bridget Grams 2909 Tomahawk Road	Change to previously approved circle drive
#2	Karen Austin 6716 Willow Lane	New fence
#3	Lauren & Aaron Blazar 5921 High Drive	New retaining wall and patio
#4	Robert & Karen Long 6404 High Drive	Changes to previously approved project
#5	Gary & Debby Cortes 6717 Belinder Avenue	New pergola in rear yard
#6	John & Heather Johntz 2608 W 67 th Street	Changes to previously approved project
#7	Gabe & Megan Egli 2810 W 68 th Street	Window/door changes
#8	Stephanie & Scott Moore 6525 High Drive	Changes to previously approved project
#9	Jaswinder & Maninder Singh 5600 Mission Drive	Landscape Plan
#10	Jeff & Anne Graves * 2220 Stratford Road	New circle drive and retaining wall

*Variance required

The Mission Hills Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) provides that the BZA shall determine whether or not an ARB decision was reasonable based upon the evidence presented to the ARB and the record of the ARB proceedings. Testimony at the BZA hearing will be limited to a discussion of the evidence presented to the ARB. No new evidence will be considered.

The Gaylin-Grams are returning to the ARB to present changes to their previously approved project.

Summary of Property:

Character Area:
 Neighborhood Estates

Location of Common Green Space: FrontAny Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

An existing tree was discovered on the property that was not previously shown on their site plan or survey. The tree is in conflict with the previously approved circle driveway. The Gaylin-Grams are proposing an alternate driveway configuration that will allow the tree to remain.

Ordinance Compliance:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.3 on pages 64 through 67 of the design guidelines provides specific recommendations for the neighborhood estates character area.

Subsection G suggests that circle driveways have an inner green a minimum of 80 feet between curb cuts and a depth of at least ½ of the width. **This recommendation has not been met.**

#2 Karen Austin 6716 Willow Lane

Ms. Austin is proposing a new fence that is not a preapproved style.

Summary of Property:

Character Area: Suburban
 Location of Common Green Space: Front
 Any Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

The proposed fence is similar to the preapproved "all lattice" fence style, but in this installation the lattice is installed square and plumb in lieu of angled.

Ordinance Compliance:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

Design Guideline Review:

The Blazars are proposing a new retaining wall in their side yard and a new patio in there rear yard.

Summary of Property:

Character Area: Neighborhood Estates

Location of Common Green Space: FrontAny Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

At the north side of the property, the Blazars are proposing a new retaining wall along there driveway. The wall will have a consistent top elevation with the lower grade on the Blazars side of the wall. The top of the wall is even, or just above, the finished grade of the neighboring property. The wall will compensate for the slope of the driveway toward the rear yard.

At the rear of the house, the Blazars are proposing a new bluestone patio. The patio is a simple rectilinear shape with steps allowing the patio to follow the topography of the rear yard.

Ordinance Compliance:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.7.3 on page 108 of the design guidelines gives specific recommendations for retaining walls. This section recommends that retaining walls, that are visible to the street, should be limited in height and should be integrated into the overall landscaping. This recommendation has been met.

The Longs are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project.

Summary of Property:

Character Area: Traditional
 Location of Common Green Space: Front
 Any Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

The original design maintained the existing cedar shake siding on the new additions. The Longs are now proposing to use Hardi plank siding on the new additions and replace all existing siding.

The ARB previously approved the project requiring the rear grade be sloped up toward the house to minimize the impact of the screened porch eave height. In lieu of that, the Longs are proposing to add a limestone planter.

Ordinance Compliance:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.4 on pages 68 through 71 of the design guidelines gives specific recommendations for the Traditional Neighborhood character area.

Subsection D suggests that rear wings extending into the conditional building area be limited to 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ stories with 12 foot eaves and a maximum height of 24 feet. This only applies to the screened porch. The Longs are proposing a solution that is not specifically addressed by the design guidelines. **Discussion is recommended.**

#5 Gary & Debby Cortés

6717 Belinder Avenue

The Cortéses are proposing a new pergola in their rear yard.

Summary of Property:

Character Area: Suburban
 Location of Common Green Space: Front
 Any Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

The proposed pergola is located toward the center of the rear yard at the corner of their existing pool. It is an open structure, constructed of cedar. It stands 8 feet tall to the bottom of the roof structure. A concrete pad will be added to the existing pool deck at the pergola.

Ordinance Compliance:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

Design Guideline Review:

The Johntzes are returning to the ARB with changes/corrections to their previously approved project.

Summary of Property:

Character Area: Suburban
 Location of Common Green Space: Front
 Any Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

The original approved drawings misrepresented multiple windows as having two vertical muntins where they actually have three.

Previously the front door was approved with a single sidelight. The Johntzes are now proposing a door with two sidelights.

Ordinance Compliance:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

Design Guideline Review:

#7 Gabe & Megan Egli

The Eglis are proposing an interior remodel that includes minor exterior window/door changes.

Due to the limited scope of the project, photo documentation has been allowed in lieu of traditional drawings.

Summary of Property:

Character Area: Suburban
 Location of Common Green Space: Front
 Any Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

At the side of the house, an existing window will be removed and enclosed.

At the rear of the house, an existing door will be relocated a few feet from its existing location, and an existing window will be replaced with a larger unit.

Ordinance Compliance:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

Design Guideline Review:

The Moores are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project. The changes include multiple window changes and the addition of a portico covering over a side door.

Summary of Property:

Character Area: Traditional
 Location of Common Green Space: Front
 Any Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

The portico has been added to the rear (east) elevation of the house over a pair of French doors. It is supported off of brackets and only extends 2 feet from the face of the house. The doors it covers were originally approved as a single door with an adjacent window. Above the portico, a small second story window will be enlarged, a new second story window added, and another eliminated.

At the north side elevation a second story window will be changed to a faux window with closed shutters. Another faux window has been added to the first floor.

Ordinance Compliance:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

Design Guideline Review:

#9 Jaswinder & Maninder Singh

The Singhs are returning to the ARB with their required landscape plan.

Summary of Property:

Character Area: Neighborhood Estates

Location of Common Green Space: Front YardAny Special Frontages: Edge Frontage

Summary of Project:

The proposed plan indicates the proposed landscaping with no additional hardscape.

Ordinance Compliance:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

Design Guidelines:

Section 2.7.3 on pages 104 through 108 of the design guidelines provides specific recommendations for landscaping. Under normal circumstances this section would recommend that the street side landscape be limited to a maintained lawn with denser landscaping located near the house. When this house was originally submitted and approved, it was approved with the understanding that dense landscaping would be provided to create a visual block for the front auto court. This requirement has been met.

Lot Information		
Zoning:	R-1(16)/LS-5	
Lot Area:	32,824 SF	
Mean Lot Width:	209.0'	
Mean Lot Depth:	140.0'	

Ordinance	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height	35'	28.0'
Minimum Front Yard: (Average of Adjacent)	22.65' From Back of Curb	26.0' From Back of Curb
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	20.9'	33.33'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	20.9'	40.0'
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	52.25'	73.33'
(25% of Mean Lot Width)		
Minimum Rear Yard:	28.0'	56.6'
(20% of Mean Lot Depth)	20.0	
Lot Coverage:	7,288 SF	6,031 SF (83% of Maximum)

The Graves are proposing a new circle driveway.

Summary of Property:

Character Area:
 Neighborhood Estates

Location of Common Green Space: FrontAny Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

The proposed circle driveway will connect the existing direct drive to a new curb cut at the opposite side of the front yard. The drive will be constructed with the same pavers as the existing driveway.

A new 2 foot tall retaining wall will be added at the back side of the drive to maintain the existing grade.

A large portion of the existing front walk will be removed as part of the project.

An existing city street tree will be relocated to allow for the new curb cut.

Ordinance Compliance:

The project is in violation of city ordinance 5-135 which forbids walls to be constructed in the front yard. A variance is required.

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.7.3 C on page 108 of the design guidelines provides specific recommendations for retaining walls. This section discourages retaining walls that are visible from a street. When unavoidable walls should be limited in height and should be integrated into the overall landscape design of the property. **Discussion is recommended.**

*

^{*} A variance is required.